

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,992	02/13/2002	William A. Burris	1111 008 301 0252	6883
	7590 11/30/201 CKERSON LLP	EXAMINER		
1777 PENFIEL	.D ROAD	CONLEY, SEAN EVERETT		
PENFIELD, N	Y 14526		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1775		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/30/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dneels@bnpatentlaw.com dmasters@bnpatentlaw.com mnickerson@bnpatentlaw.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/074,992	BURRIS ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	SEAN E. CONLEY	1775			

	SEAN E. CONLEY	1775					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to ro on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies; (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41,31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7.	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final reject	on.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1						
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed any reply must be filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS		20					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,     (a) They raise new issues that would require further co     (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below the second of the	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)     Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ol>		II be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5,7-18,20-31,33 and 34.							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3,5,7-18,20-31,33 and 34.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	ned.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	OF AN E OON 57"						
	/SEAN E CONLEY/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1775					

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicants arguments have been considered but are not persuasive. Concerning the finality of the office action, the Examiner disagrees with the argument that it is premature. The claim amendment "when the device is operating" overcame the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection of the non-final office action but also changed the scope of the claim. The change in scope of the claims necessitated the new grounds of rejection and the opened the door to the possibility of applying new prior art as well as any prior art previously cited that may still apply. The new grounds of rejection otted by the Examiner addresses this new claim limitation. The new limitation is a functional limitation that is capable of being performed by the combination of Contreras and Burirs as stated in the final rejection. The Applicant's remaining arguments are directed to the functions of the device and not the structural differences between the device and the prior art. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5, 7-18, 20-31, 33 and 34 remain rejected for the reasons set forth in the final office action.

/SFC/